REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action mailed July 14, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive to that office action. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-22 remain in this application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, 15, 19 are currently amended. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-4 and 12-22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Agulnick, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,347,295). Claims 5-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agulnick.

Agulnick, either alone or in combination with the other prior art of record, does not teach or suggest "triggering handwriting recognition for handwriting entered in the handwriting-recognition task area based upon determining the pen has moved up from the inking position into the non-inking position and that the pen's mapped location on the writing surface has moved from inside the handwriting-recognition task area to outside of the handwriting-recognition task area."

Claim 1 recites a method of triggering handwriting recognition, the method comprising: determining that a pen has moved up from an inking position to a non-inking position; mapping the pen's location onto a writing surface while the pen is in the non-inking position and is separated from the writing surface by a distance that is greater than zero and less than or equal to a maximum trackable distance; determining that the pen's mapped location on the writing surface has moved from inside a handwriting-recognition task area to outside of the handwriting-recognition task area; and triggering handwriting recognition for handwriting entered in the handwriting-recognition task area based upon determining that the pen has moved up from the inking position into the non-inking position and that the pen's mapped location on the writing surface has moved from inside the handwriting-recognition task area to outside of the handwriting-recognition task area.

Agulnick discloses a notebook computer that is controlled by a stylus executing gestures on the computer screen. The computer senses the proximity of the stylus tip to the screen. The proximity sensing is used to detect the approach of the stylus tip to the computer screen, and

gestural commands are then entered on the screen by moving the stylus. The entry of a command is terminated by removing the stylus tip from proximity with the screen, which is detected by the computer, which then implements the command. (Abstract). Agulnick discloses termination of input events based on sensing "the departure of the stylus tip from the vicinity of the display surface." (Column 3, lines 57-66). In other words, moving the stylus away from the display screen causes the computer to terminate an input event. Agulnick does not teach or suggest using a location, which is mapped onto the display screen, of the stylus once the stylus has been moved away from the display screen, for determining when an input event should be terminated.

Accordingly, Agulnick, either alone or in combination with the other references of record, does not teach or suggest "triggering handwriting recognition for handwriting entered in the handwriting-recognition task area based upon determining the pen has moved up from the inking position into the non-inking position and that the pen's mapped location on the writing surface has moved from inside the handwriting-recognition task area to outside of the handwriting-recognition task area."

The invention as recited in claim 1 provides a significant functional advantage by triggering handwriting recognition in a timelier manner than the system disclosed by Agulnick. For instance, when a user finishes writing in a first handwriting-recognition task area, lifts the pen off the writing surface less than the maximum trackable distance of the pen, and moves the pen such that the pen's mapped location on the writing surface moves out of the first handwriting-recognition task area, handwriting recognition is then automatically triggered thereby advantageously allowing a computer to perform handwriting-recognition processing while the user moves the pen to another handwriting-recognition task area. On the other hand, the system disclosed by Agulnick requires a user to move the stylus farther away from the display screen than the maximum trackable distance of the stylus in order to terminate the input event. By performing handwriting-recognition processing while the user moves the pen from the first handwriting-recognition task area to another handwriting-recognition task area, handwriting recognition results, including a list of alternative recognition results, may be presented to the user sooner rather than later. In this way, handwriting recognition results, including a list of

alternative recognition results, may be advantageously presented to the user while the handwriting entered into the first handwriting-recognition task area is still fresh in the user's mind. In contrast, the system disclosed by Agulnick results in users writing in multiple areas before the computer recognizes termination of the input event.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 9, 12, 15, and 19 contain limitations that are analogous to the limitations of claim 1 discussed above. Claims 5, 9, 12, 15, and 19 are, therefore, in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Further with respect to claim 5, page 7 of the office action states that setting and clearing the inking flag are obvious matters of design choice. Applicant respectfully disagrees because setting and clearing the inking flag allow the invention of claim 5 to provide timelier triggering of handwriting recognition, in the manner discussed above in connection with claim 1, relative to the system disclosed by Agulnick.

Claims 3-4, 6-8, 11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20-22 are proper dependent claims and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

Appln. No.: 10/071,306
Amendment dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 14, 2005

By: _____, 4-1,805
William J. Klein
Registration No. 43,719

10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001